

AN EARLIER NAME FOR BOBEA ELATIOR (RUBIACEAE)

HAWAIIAN PLANT STUDIES 46

Harold St. John and Derral Herbst
B. P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii,
96818, and
Lyon Arboretum, University of Hawaii,
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96822, U. S. A.

The Frenchman Charles Gaudichaud-Beaupré was not the first botanist to explore and collect plant specimens on the Hawaiian Islands, but his accomplishments were preeminent. A large percentage of the local genera and species were discovered and described by him. Most of this, too, was accomplished on his first trip, in 1819 on the ship *Uranie*. On each excursion he started from the ship in the harbor and hiked up the valleys and mountains on foot. He visited only three islands, and his total of days on shore was only seven, still his gatherings and discoveries were phenomenal.

One such discovery on the island of Oahu was his *Bobea elatior* (1830: 473, t. 93). It had been previously studied by Chamisso, of the voyage of the *Rurik*, and published one year earlier. Because of this priority, the following new combination is needed.

Bobea Gaudichaudii (C. & S.) comb. nov.

Burneya Gaudichaudii C. & S., *Linnaea* 4: 190-191, 1829.

Timonius Gaudichaudii (C. & S.) DC., *Prodr.* 4: 461, 1830, late Sept.

Bobea elatior Gaud. *Voy. Uranie Bot.* 473, 1830, March 6; *Atlas* t. 93, 1830.

B. Gaudichaudii (C. & S.) Skottsb., *Acta Hort. Gotob.* 15: 467, 1944, an invalid binomial.

De Candolle (1830: 461) had specimens of both species available, recognized their identity and listed *B. elatior* as a synonym of his *Timonius Gaudichaudii*. There seems no question but that the two binomials apply to the same common tree of Oahu.

The binomial published by Skottsberg (1944: 467) is in need of a discussion. Under his treatment of *Bobea elatior* Gaud., which he accepted, Skottsberg

remarked: "The oldest name for this species is perhaps Burneya Gaudichaudii Cham. et Schlecht., 1829, . . . In Freyc. Uranie Bot. the text for B. elatior was published on 6 March 1830. The dates for the publication of the plates are not known. If . . . pl. 93, which is valid as a description, was published before 1830, the correct combination will be Bobea Gaudichaudii (Cham. et Schlecht.)."

The combination Bobea Gaudichaudii proposed by Skottsberg is clearly a provisional one, and also one not accepted by its author. Such names are invalid under the provisions of Article 34 of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1972).